

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12, 14-36 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Parikh et al. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Parikh et al. teach a call management system (CMS) to which all subscriber calls are terminated (Col. 3, lines 48-51 and claim 1). As understood by any person skilled in the art, the CMS 110 is a physical network termination having a plurality of voice cards 133 that terminate trunk(s) or line(s) connections to the PSTN 134. Calls are directed to the CMS 110 using direct inward dial (DID) numbers (FIG. 3 and Col 5, lines 1-10). The CMS 110 does not park calls, it answers the calls and “places the caller on hold” (Col. 7, lines 36-37) while a SMS message is sent to the subscriber’s mobile telephone (Col. 7, lines 37-48).

Parikh et al. teach a fundamentally different approach to the problem solved by the instant invention, which provides inbound call management and single number services using a virtual PSTN node (call service node) and one or more call parking facilities where calls are parked in the network pending a response from the service subscriber. As clearly described in the instant application, the call service node (CSN) has no physical line terminations. Consequently, the CSN does not and cannot terminate calls or put calls on hold. The CSN forwards all calls to a call parking facility in the network while waiting for a subscriber reply to an inbound call notification message. As compared to Parikh et al., the CSN has a profoundly beneficial impact on PSTN resource usage, as well as service flexibility. Network resources are used most efficiently, and maximum service flexibility is ensured, because the CSN always remains in complete control of the call throughout its duration, but no voice trunk looping occurs. Parikh et al. therefore fail to teach or suggest the invention claimed in claims 1-12, 14-36 and 38.

In particular, the rejection of claims 1 and 26 is flawed for at least the following reasons:

- 1) Parikh et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed “receiving a call initiation message at a call service node (CSN)”. As explained above, Parikh et al. terminates calls at a call management system (CMS 110), which operates on a completely different principle than the CSN, which is a virtual node in the carrier network of the PSTN that does not terminate calls. Consequently, Parikh et al.’s CMS 110 does not receive any call initiation messages, it only receives a call termination indication along with certain information associated with the call, as explained below in more detail;

- 2) Parikh et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed “extracting a called number from the call initiation message” Parikh et al. receives the DID and CLID from the PSTN (Col. 5, lines 3-5), and the CMS 110 is not adapted to extract a called number from a call initiation message because the CMS 110 has no knowledge of PSTN call control signaling protocols;
- 3) Parikh et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed “routing the call from the CSN to a call parking facility associated with the service”. As explained above, Parikh et al. terminates calls and puts the calls on hold, which is a completely different approach to call handling. Parikh et al. uses call termination resources (voice cards 133) at the CMS 110 to hold the calls, whereas, the CSN forwards calls using call control signaling messages to a call parking facility in the network; and
- 4) Parikh et al. fails to teach or suggest “controlling the call from the CSN”. Parikh et al. places a call to the forwarding number received in the subscriber reply message (Col. 5, line 66 – Col. 6, line line 2). Optionally, Parikh et al.’s CMS 110 may send a “call bridge” instruction to the terminating PSTN switch if the call is blind transferred to save CMS 110 resources (Col. 6, Lines 12-28). This teaches away from “controlling the call from the CSN” which is accomplished with call control signaling without use of any call termination resources, and without loss of control of the call.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that on a fair interpretation of the limitations of claims 1 and 26, neither claim 1 or 26 is anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Parikh et al. However, in order to further unequivocally distinguish over Parikh et al., claims 1 and 26 are amended to claim that the call initiation message is routed to the call service node (CSN); that while waiting for a reply to the inbound call notification message, the call initiation message is routed from the CSN to forward the call to a call parking facility associated with the service; and further controlling the call by sending a call release message from the CSN to release the call from the call parking facility. It is therefore respectfully submitted that since the final rejection failed to consider all of the limitations of claims 1 and 26, this amendment should be entered because no further search is required. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 12 are amended to accord with amended claim 1. Claims 27, 28, 32-36 and 38 are amended to accord with the amendments made to claim 26. Claims 17-25 are cancelled.

The rejection of claims 1-12, 14-36 and 38 is thereby traversed

Appl. No. 10/806,135
Amdt. dated Feb. 6, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 7, 2007

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 13 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parikh et al. in view of Bannister.

For reasons set forth above in detail, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 26, from which claims 13 and 37 respectfully depend, are neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Parikh et al. The rejection of claims 13 and 37 is thereby traversed.

In view of the amendments made to the above-noted claims, and for reasons set forth above in detail, this application is now considered to be in a condition for immediate allowance. Favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,
L. Lloyd Williams et al.

/Kent Daniels/

By: Kent Daniels, P.Eng.
Reg. No. 44206
Attorney for the Applicants

Date: February 6, 2008

Ogilvy Renault LLP
Suite 1600
1981 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, Quebec
Canada, H3A 2Y3
(613) 780-8673